

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Non-Final Office Action of October 8, 2010, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-26 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-26 therefore remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. These claims have been amended to recite a “non-transitory memory.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,870,683 to Wells et al. (“Wells”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,001 to Gonsalves et al. (“Gonsalves”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,237 to Montalbano et al. (“Montalbano”).

Claims 2-4 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells in view of Gonsalves in further view of Montalbano in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,835 to Gevers et al. (“Gevers”).

Claims 5, 12 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells in view of Gonsalves in further view of Montalbano in further view of Bickmore et al., “Web Page Filtering and Re-Authenticating for Mobile Users” (“Bickmore”).

Claims 6, 13, 17, 18, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells in view of Gonsalves in further view of Montalbano in further view of Bickmore in further view of “GIF Construction Set Professional Homepage” (“GCSPH”) and “GIF Construction Set Professional Manual” (“GCSPM”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claims 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells in view of Gonsalves in further view of Montalbano and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,223,190 to Aihara (“Aihara”).

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, the following:

- receiving, by a computing device, a user-selection of a time-based sequence of images, the time-based sequence of images including first images in a predetermined display order with predetermined time intervals between the first images, and the time-based sequence of images being associated with a window size;

- comparing the window size with one or more window size parameters for an application of a mobile device to determine whether the window size is supported by the application of the mobile device;

- responsive to determining that the window size is not supported by the application of the mobile device, displaying, on a display of the computing device, one or more of the first images with an indication of the allowable window size in a display layout;

- receiving one or more user instructions for modifying the display layout; and

- storing the time-based sequence of images according to the display layout, resulting in a stored version of the time-based sequence of images that is supported by the application of the mobile device.

The Office Action relies on a combination of Wells, Montalbano, and Gonsalves in rejecting claim 1. (Office Action, pages 4-6.) However, either alone or in any combination, none of Wells, Montalbano and/or Gonzalves teaches or suggests the features recited above with respect to claim 1.

Wells describes a “mobile station” that can be adapted to “enable or disable the display of a graphical information sequence; and/or select a graphical information sequence to be displayed from a plurality of pre-stored graphical information sequence; and/or input a definition of a graphical information sequence from an external source for storage in the mobile station.” Wells, Abstract. Such a mobile station does not teach or suggest the above features of claim 1. For example, such a mobile station does not teach or suggest “comparing the window size with one or more window size parameters for an application of a mobile device to determine whether the window size is supported by the application of the mobile device; [and] responsive to determining that the window size is not supported by the application of the mobile device, displaying, on a display of the computing device, one or more of the first images with an indication of the allowable window size in a display layout,” as recited by claim 1.

Montalbano fails to cure the deficiencies of Wells. Montalbano describes a system that allows a user to be “presented with a set of multimedia bookmark representations.” Montalbano, Abstract. In Montalbano, these representations may be presented with changed appearances, animated, or presented with an audio accompaniment when the user places a cursor over, or

otherwise selects, a representation. *Id.* Presenting and changing the “multimedia bookmark representations,” as in Montalbano, does not teach or suggest the above features of claim 1. For example, presenting and changing the “multimedia bookmark representations” does not teach or suggest “comparing the window size with one or more window size parameters for an application of a mobile device to determine whether the window size is supported by the application of the mobile device; [and] responsive to determining that the window size is not supported by the application of the mobile device, displaying, on a display of the computing device, one or more of the first images with an indication of the allowable window size in a display layout,” as recited by claim 1.

Gonzalves fails to cure the deficiencies of Wells and Montalbano. Gonzalves describes “a mechanism and process for changing a color of an image.” Gonzalves, Abstract. Merely changing a color of an image does not teach or suggest the above features of claim 1. For example, changing a color of an image does not teach or suggest “comparing the window size with one or more window size parameters for an application of a mobile device to determine whether the window size is supported by the application of the mobile device; [and] responsive to determining that the window size is not supported by the application of the mobile device, displaying, on a display of the computing device, one or more of the first images with an indication of the allowable window size in a display layout,” as recited by claim 1.

Independent claims 8 and 19, while different in scope, recite features substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 8 and 19 are similarly allowable over Webb, Montalbano and Gonzalves for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-6, 9-13, 15-18 and 20-26 depend from one of independent claims 1, 8 and 19, and are allowable over Webb, Montalbano and Gonzalves for the same reasons as their respective base claim, and further in view of the various novel and non-obvious features recited therein. Any addition of Gever, Bickmore, GCSPH, GCSPM, and/or Aihara, while cited for other features, fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Webb, Montalbano and Gonzalves.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 7, 2011

By: /Evan M Clark/
Evan M. Clark
Reg. No. 64,836
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001